

BEFORE THE  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

PUBLIC MEETING

Pacific City Council Chambers  
2212 Beach Boulevard  
Pacifica, California 94044

Tuesday, September 16, 2003

REPORTER: JAMES W. HIGGINS, CVR

GOLDEN GATE NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

- - -

PUBLIC MEETING

- - -

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 16, 2003

- - -

Pacifica City Council Chambers

2212 Beach Boulevard

Pacifica, California 94044

The meeting was convened, pursuant to  
Notice, at 7:00 p.m., Tina Stott, Moderator.

For the Golden Gate National Recreation Area:

MAI-LIIS BARTLING, Acting Superintendent

NANCY HORNOR, Director of Planning

STAFF LIAISON:

MICHAEL FEINSTEIN, GGNRA

## C O N T E N T S

	PAGE
OPENING REMARKS, TINA STOTT, FACILITATOR	6
OPENING REMARKS,	
MAI-LISS BARTLING, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT	6
GGNRA DRAFT FIRE MANAGEMENT PLAN (SCOPING)	12
Alex Naar, Fire Management Officer.	13
PUBLIC COMMENT	20
STATEMENT OF:.	
Mary McAlister	20
Nancy Wuerfel	22
Jackie Johnson	24
Suzanne Valente	25
Vi Gotelli	27
Stephen Golub	28
Carolyn Blair	29
UPDATE STATUS OF PLANNING AND NATIONAL PARK SERVICE LAND ACQUISITION IN SAN MATEO COUNTY (MORI POINT, PICARDO RANCH, PEDRO POINT HEADLANDS, CATTLE HILL AND OTHER SITES	33
Nancy Hornor, Director of Planning, GGNRA	33
PUBLIC COMMENT	41
STATEMENT OF:	
Lisa Vittori	41

## PRESENTATION OF NEW STEWARDSHIP PROGRAM AT MORI POINT

Sue Gardner, Golden Gate National Parks Conservancy	44
PUBLIC COMMENT	51
STATEMENT OF:	
John Keating, Esq.	51
Jeri Flinn	53
Lisa Vittori	55
REPORT ON HABITAT RESTORATION FOR THE ENDANGERED SAN FRANCISCO GARTER SNAKE	57
Darren Fong, Ecologist, Natural Resources	58
PUBLIC COMMENT	64
STATEMENT OF:	
Frank Deering, Native Californians for Stream Fishing	64
Ron Maykel	67
Nancy Wuerfel	69
Vi Vitelli	70
Vern Smith	71
BAY AREA RIDGE TRAIL OPENING IN SAN FRANCISCO WATERSHED	
Bob Power, South and East Bay Trails Director, Bay Area Ridge Trail Council	74
GGNRA TRAIL CAMPAIGN "TRAILS FOREVER"	82
Kate Bickert, GGNP Conservancy	83
Steve Griswold, Landscape Architect, GGNRA	86
Scott Holmes, Coastal Trail	88

SUPERINTENDENT'S REPORT	89
Mai-Liis Bartling, Acting Superintendent, GGNRA	
OPEN COMMENT	92
STATEMENT OF:	
Julie Lancelle	92
Lisa Vittori	94
Jon Rayner	97

## P R O C E E D I N G S

7:00 P.M.

MS. STOTT: Good evening. If everyone could sit down, please, we'll start the meeting. I'd like to thank you for coming tonight, and welcome you to tonight's GGNRA Public Meeting.

I'd like to say that we're very pleased to be here in Pacifica and to hear your comments about the GGNRA and the projects and activities they're doing in the region.

I am Tina Stott, and I will be your meeting facilitator tonight. My role will be to help us stay on schedule and also to help the meeting run smoothly.

I would also like to introduce two representatives from the GGNRA: Mai-Liis Bartling, who is the GGNRA Acting Superintendent; Nancy Hornor, who is the GGNRA Chief of Planning.

I think Mai-Liis would like to say a couple of words before we start.

ACTING SUPERINTENDENT BARTLING: I'd also like to welcome you and thank you for your interest in this meeting. It's important that we be here in San Mateo. This is going to be increasingly an area of emphasis for the park. And I'd like to encourage you to call, call our park, if you have questions, if you have

concerns, issues, and talk to staff.

And I'd also like to thank the Pacifica Tribune, and the San Mateo County Times for continuing to report on park issues.

Thank you.

MS. STOTT: Thank you, Mai-Liis.

You may notice -- although we don't come to Pacifica as often as we might -- you might notice that we are continuing to use an interim meeting format, which appears a bit different from Advisory Commission that was meeting last year about this time. But the meeting serves a similar purpose. We are here to give you the opportunity to provide public input on pending projects affecting the GGNRA, and also to allow staff to give you information on those projects. Staff will not be making and decisions at this meeting, but are here just to take your comments.

We will be following this meeting format while we await reauthorization of the Advisory Commission. And, so far, we don't know when that will be. So, lieu of the Advisory Commission meetings, these meetings will be held on the third Tuesday of every other month. And we rotate locations between San Francisco, San Mateo County, and Marin County. So the next meeting will be held in November, on Tuesday the

eighteenth, at Building 201 in Fort Mason in San Francisco..

At the back of the room, there are agendas, and there's also a sign-up sheet. If you didn't receive a notice for this meeting in the mail, please sign the sheet and we will add you to the mailing list. But if you did get something in the mail, please don't sign up again.

A couple of logistical items: First, all our agenda items tonight, except Item 1, the public scoping for the Draft Fire Management Plan, are going to be informational items; but we will be taking public comment on all the items. So you're welcome to make comments, or ask questions of the presenters, after each agenda item. But what we'd ask you to do is to sign up in the back on a sign-up sheet so we can call your name and have you come up to the front and speak and state your name.

So, if you hear a presentation and then want to speak, it would be great if you could sign up; but, otherwise, we'll also take a show of hands if you want to speak that way.

There is also an opportunity to comment at the very end, during the Open Comment Period, on topics that we aren't -- that aren't on the agenda tonight. So



you can sign up to do that. Also, the scoping period for the Fort Mason Center Long-term Lease Environmental Assessment closes on September twenty-second. So, if you want to make any other scoping comments on that project, you can do that, as well, by signing up on the sign-up sheet in the back.

We have a few guidelines for public comments. I will call your name from the sign-up sheet when it's your turn to speak. So, if you could come to this podium -- Is that where you want people to come? -- and then address your comments to the staff of the park, and the presenters, and state your name before you start speaking, so we can record the comments.

To save time, I will also call the subsequent speaker, who can just wait in the wings until it's your turn to speak. If you prefer not to speak, you can write your question or your comment on one of the cards in the back of the room, and then identify your agenda item on that card. I will read the questions at the end, following the presentation or the comments, and I'll make -- you can make your comment that way.

Each speaker has three minutes to speak. I'll let you know when your time is up. And if a group of you have a common issue, if you could pick one or two spokespersons who can present your suggestions, that

will help the meeting move along smoothly. Also, if you concur with the previous speaker, a simple statement that you concur helps us keep the meeting going, as well.

Also, we love to get written correspondence. It's very effective, and we can refer back to it. So if you would like to write any letters or comments following the meeting, that would be great. Each presenter will give mailing addresses tonight, and e-mail addresses, if you want to submit comments that way.

Let's see? Similar to the Advisory Commission Meetings, this meeting is being recorded by a court reporter and will transcribe it for public and staff use.

Then, in terms of just general ground rules, please, only one person talking at a time. Respect the opinions of others and be courteous to others, even if you disagree with what they have to say, because everyone's opinion is valid. Do not criticize the speakers or make personal attacks.

A little bit about the room: The restrooms are behind this wall. Also, to park in the lot out in front, you need a parking permit, which there are some in the back of the room on the table, and some

downstairs by the elevator. So, if you didn't put one in your car dash, you should probably do that now.

[Several speakers made comments regarding the parking rule.]

MS. STOTT: So skip that directive.

So, I want to, first, just quickly review the agenda. We have six agenda items, plus the public-comment period. The first thing we'll do is take scoping comments on the GGNRA Draft Fire Management Plan. That will be preceded by a presentation on the future plan.

Then we'll talk about the status of planning and National Park Service land acquisition in San Mateo County. Then we'll do a presentation of the New stewardship program at Mori Point, followed by a report on habitat restoration for the endangered San Francisco garter snake. A fifth agenda item is the Bay Area Ridge Trail opening on the San Francisco Watershed. Then we'll talk about the GGNRA trails campaign, which is called "Trails Forever." Then we'll follow that up, at the very end, with the Superintendent's Report, and the open-comment period. Again, during that period, you can also talk about your comments on the Fort Mason long-term lease.

So, what I'd like to do now is to turn it

over to Mai-Liis Bartling, again, who is the acting Superintendent, and she will present, or give opening comments on the scoping for the GGNRA Draft Fire Management Plan.

GGNRA DRAFT FIRE MANAGEMENT PLAN (SCOPING)

MAI-LISS BARTLING, ACTING SUPERINTENDENT, GGNRA

ALEX NAAR, FIRE MANAGEMENT OFFICER, GGNRA

ACTING SUPERINTENDENT BARTLING: I'd like to just say a few words before we get started with the specifics of this agenda item.

First, I just want to acknowledge the agenda might have been a little confusing. It's says "Draft Fire Management Plan." We're not here to present a draft plan. This is very early in the process. We're here for scoping.

The other thing is: I think there might be a little bit of confusion as to why we need to do a Fire Management Plan. So let me just address that, for a moment.

The Park Service is required to do Fire Management Plans wherever there is vegetation that's capable of burning. Our existing Fire Management Plan is old. It was written in 1993, and the plans are supposed to have a life of 5 years, and it's considered out of date and in need of updating. Not to mention

that our guidelines and rules for Fire Management Plans have changed in between.

Many of you may remember the Los Alamos Fire several years ago. That very much sensitized the Park Service to the need for Fire Management Planning, and for meeting its responsibilities, as relates particularly to the Wildlife Urban Interface. Our main concerns are the public's safety, the protection of property, as well as the protection of park natural and cultural resources.

As I said a minute ago, we are in scoping. What that means is, is we're here to listen to your input about the issues, the range of alternatives, and the important environmental considerations. We need, you know, we need the public's comments, and that's really what we're here to do tonight.

I want to introduce Alex Naar, who is our Fire Management Officer. He will introduce the team that will be working on the Fire Management Plan, as well as lead off the presentation.

MR. NAAR: Hi! I'm Alex Naar, the Fire Management Officer. Mai-Liis is quite correct: Not only don't we have a Draft Fire Management Plan, we're really at the ground floor of our plan, and planning process, I should say.

August sixth, in the Federal Register, was published our notice of intent to begin the planning process. This is, indeed, the first public meeting. Next Wednesday, the twenty-fourth, we have a two-hour -- or is it an hour? -- an hour-and-a-half meeting, 7:00 to 8:30 in the evening, in Sausalito, at the Bay Model. And that is devoted entirely to public scoping. Then, in November -- is the 18th, the next public meeting? -- we'll also talk about the Fire Management Plan again there.

All national parks, with burnable vegetation, are going through this process across the country. Several hundred parks have burnable vegetation. So we're in the process of not only gathering public comment and ideas, and thoughts, and criticisms of, perhaps, our old plan, or other park's plans; but also gathering internal input. We have held two internal scoping sessions for park staff. We had about 60 people from different divisions come. Some of the documents, or posters, that you see, with issues and goals, are the result of that.

The park decided that the planning process be made, or the planning group, the core team, for this whole Fire Management Plan, represent all divisions of the park. So I'd just like to point out a few people in

the room.

Right here, Wendy Poinsoot is our fire compliance person. And, in the back, Carrie Robin, has just joined us as a planning consultant. Next to her, Paul McLaughlin, who represents the Natural Resource Division. Then Jen Vick, also from the Planning Division. Behind her, in the yellow, is our superstar intern from the Student Conservation Association. And who else is here? Steve Haller represents Cultural Resources. He's our park historian. And Rudy Evenson, back here, is from the Division of Public Affairs. So -- also, where's Alanna? Somewhere. Alanna Donohoe is our fire program assistant, and is coordinating and tracking all the documents.

Not only are we capturing public and internal input, we will be having an agency scoping session. So, for instance, the fire chief and his deputy, in the back of the room, and fire chiefs from all the towns and cities next to the GGNRA, and the counties, Marin, San Francisco, and San Mateo, as well as CDF, California Department of Forestry, will be meeting at some point in the next six weeks, or so, to discuss issues connected to the Fire Management Plan and planning process.

One thing that Mai-Liis mentioned was WUI, which is Wildlife Urban Interface. I thought I'd just

clarify what we mean by that. It's the interface where wildland and urban meet. Urban structures. So even single-family homes are considered an urban area. So where GGNRA land, or other non-GGNRA land that is wild, meets residential or commercial, or even park structures and properties.

We have, we think, between 50 and 60 miles of interface in GGNRA. So from Point Reyes, below Point Reyes, somewhere in the Stinson Beach-Bolinas area, all the way down to Half Moon Bay. Is that right? Different points, the Phleger Estate.

Our '93 plan called primarily for suppression -- well, actually, completely for suppression of any wildland fire. And it also called for, in places, mostly in Marin, I believe, the application of fire deliberately, what we call prescribed fire, to the landscape. This plan, the one we're working on right now -- and our target date is December '04, really, to come up with a draft. Is that correct, Wendy? When will our draft be out?

MS. POINSOT: We're expecting a draft to be out in August '04.

MR. MAAR: Okay. So August '04, our draft will be then. But in that draft, and in the planning process, we'll look at how, if -- how we want to use



fire, if at all, on the landscape. And using fire might be letting a wildland fire burn. We have very few natural fires along the coast. Lightning typically starts natural fires. We don't get much lightning. However, for the last month, the Bay Area has seen quite a bit of lightning.

We might use fire to achieve natural or cultural resource goals. We might use fire to achieve fire goals, putting fire on the landscape to reduce what we call "fuel buildup," where vegetation -- or we might not do that. We also might use mechanical, what we call mechanical treatments. So going in and mowing along fire roads, removing certain trees that have spread across fire roads and present a hazard to firefighters, or to the public, or to our park staff. Everything is -- I guess my point is everything is up for grabs, if you will. We have no projects planned for San Mateo, or for Marin, at the end of this planning process. It's really up to you, to us, and other members of the public.

We have several ways that you can comment. Certainly, tonight and next Wednesday, and in November at the public meeting. You can e-mail us, and there's a handout in the back that has the e-mail address to do that. Or, you can write the Park Superintendent, with

the Fire Management Plan, you know, in the subject heading, Attention: Fire Management Plan.

What else should I talk about?

I mentioned that the Notice of Intent was published on August fifth. Steve's pointing at something. The goals. I'll get there in a second. The end of the comment period is December fifth of this year. Is that right? Okay.

So I'll just quickly run through that chart, which I'm sure some of you can't see. I can't see it from here, but I have a cheat sheet. And I think it might be valuable to just read the nine goals that the core team, after three weeks of debate and deliberation, came up with.

1. Insure that public and firefighter safety is the highest priority for all fire management activities.

2. Reduce wildland fire risks to private and public property.

3. Protect natural resources from adverse effects of fire and fire management activities, and use fire management wherever appropriate to sustain and restore natural resources.

4. Preserve historic structures, landscapes and archeological resources from adverse effects of fire

and fire management activities, and use fire management wherever appropriate to rehabilitate or restore these cultural resources.

5. Refine management practices by improving knowledge and understanding of fire through research and monitoring.

6. Develop and maintain staff expertise in all aspects of fire management.

7. Effectively integrate the fire management program into the park and park-partner activities.

8. Foster informed public participation in fire management activities.

9. Foster and maintain interagency fire management partnerships and contribute to the fire-fighting effort at the local, state and national level.

I think what's unique, or what differentiates this planning process from the '93 plan -- and I wasn't here for that -- but that we are working at it together in the park. My office, the Fire Management Office, really is not pushing this plan forward. What we will do, at the end of the planning process, is do, again, what the rest of the park, the natural and cultural resources folks, maintenance folks, law enforcement, public affairs, what they feel are the important goals.

Where we have areas that coincide and overlap, priority-wise -- again, natural resources and cultural resource -- and, then, maybe there's some fire goals reducing the threat to public property, that's great. Those might be the projects we move forward on.

I think we can take a few moments to get comment now. Is that right? Or questions? I know it's a lot of information, but is there a sign-up list? How does that work? Tina has it, okay.

Anything from the team members, real quickly?

(No response.)

#### PUBLIC COMMENT

MS. STOTT: We have about ten commenters on this topic. The first speaker is Mary McAlister, followed by Nancy Wuerfel. And if you could just wait in the wings. You have three minutes.

#### STATEMENT OF

MARY MC ALISTER

MS. MS ALISTER: Thank you.

I live in the Sunset District in San Francisco, and we have many things in common with Pacifica. We're drenched in fog about half of the year; and the other half of the year, we're bombarded with high winds.

Fire hazard is not an issue for us. In fact,

your fire history map sort of substantiates that. But another thing that we have in common with San Mateo County is that the native plant movement has a stranglehold on our public lands. Thousands of our non-native trees have been destroyed in San Francisco by the native plant fanatics, many in the dark of night. The Fire Management Plan looks as though it could be another means to destroy more non-native trees using fire hazard as an excuse.

I hope the good people of San Mateo County understand that their trees are in jeopardy. I hope they realize that the loss of their trees will expose them to uncomfortable winds and the loss of their own trees on their own property because of the exposure of their trees to the winds.

Thank you very much. I hope you'll take this into consideration in evaluating the proposals that you hear. I think that the native-plant movement is getting better and better at cleaning up its message, and this is what this looks like, superficially.

Thank you.

MS. STOTT: Thank you.

And our next speaker is Nancy Wuerfel, followed by Jackie Johnson.

## STATEMENT OF

NANCY WUERFEL

MS. WUERFEL: Good evening. My name is Nancy Wuerfel, and I also live in San Francisco.

My concern about this program in San Mateo, and in Marin County, had to do with the precedent-setting nature of this plan. There is no excuse for fire in San Francisco. We are the second most densely packed city in the United States. I would like to suggest, right now, that any plans that the National Park Service has for any kind of fire management exclude the City and County of San Francisco. And that includes the Presidio, because I consider that part of my city. It geographically belongs there, even though it's owned by other people, called the Federal Government.

So I want to talk about the precedent-setting nature of what we're doing here, the copycat nature of -- you talk about restoring natural resources. If this becomes some sort of plan to restore wild seeds of grasses, then, all of a sudden we have deal with copying this in San Francisco for own natural areas, I'm going to be very upset that it started in the hinterlands and crept into a major metropolitan area.

There's another problem that our natural areas program in San Francisco has brought up, and it's called "debris." They cut down these trees and they do severe pruning, and they leave their crap around. This is what we call a fire hazard. So they're creating a problem that I don't want to have spontaneous combustion, then, say to people like this plan: Oh my God! We got fire here! Well, they started it because they did not maintain the grasslands properly, and they didn't take their brush away and dispose of it appropriately. They created a problem, which is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

So my concern is that there is going to be some creeping into San Francisco in a program that you're trying to intend in the hinterlands, in the wildlands, outside of an urban city, and I don't want it to come into an urban setting by any remote sense. And I'm not condoning any kind of tree destruction in the wildlands. I consider everyone of our trees a natural resource. Everyone of the eucalyptus is my resource. Everyone of the pines. Everything that is non-native is just as beautiful to me as the natives.

Thank you for your time.

MS. STOTT: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Jackie Johnson,

followed by Suzanne Valente.

STATEMENT OF  
JACKIE JOHNSON

MS. JOHNSON: Hi! I'm Jackie Johnson.

I just want people to notice that they've specifically mentioned invasive species. There are other species, besides the invasive ones, which probably should be under fire management, too.

And the other thing is: on the thing that was sent out to us, it specifically mentioned Fort Funston and Alcatraz. Well, Fort Funston is surrounded by two major roads, a golf course and the ocean. If a fire got started there, it wouldn't go any place. What Fort Funston needs is normal maintenance. They have trees that have branches that are just stuck in there, that have already fallen off, but haven't hit the ground yet. And they have a lot of dead wood out there.

Therefore, I think, if you're going to do something, do it where it will do some good, not out at Fort Funston.

Thank you. They need normal maintenance there.

MS. STOTT: Thank you.

Suzanne Valente, followed by Vi Gotelli.



STATEMENT OF  
SUZANNE VALENTE

MS. VALENTE: Hi! My name is Suzanne Valente. I live here in Pacifica.

I read the plan, the Fire Management Plan, that's on your web site, and my conclusion was that, at least here in Pacifica, I feel like your addressing a problem that is of minor significance. Wildfires are not a pressing matter here in Pacifica.

I consulted our Fire Department to find out how many wildfires they respond to. In 2002, only 5,000 of the calls they had were for fires that were other than structures, and not all of those -- in fact, none of them -- they couldn't tell me for sure -- were wildfires. We have a lot of moisture, fog and humidity here. That's not a major thing for us. But what I noticed is, in looking at it, I think that there is some huge downside to this plan; and, since you're addressing a minor problem, I don't see much advantage.

The downsides I see are that controlled burns create air pollution. Controlled burns can get out of control. For example: We know San Bruno Mountain had a huge problem recently, where private and public property was damaged. There was danger to

and destruction of wildlife there. And elimination of trees will predispose us to landslides here in Pacifica, which is a big deal in the Pacifica. We've lost far more lives in Pacifica to landslides, since I've lived here for the last 20 years, than we have to wildfires.

Subjectively, I think the majority of the people who live here in Pacifica want trees to stay. We value every tree in our landscape. They improve our air quality, and we visually appreciate them. So to eliminate any trees is a downside for us, the majority of people. I will admit there are a few people who probably have issues of native versus non-native, and discriminate in that manner.

My conclusion is that I think your wildfire plan, of just watching and waiting, is a good one, the one you had in 1993. Here in Pacifica, if you were to implement wildfire management plans, such as I saw on your web site, I would conclude that it really was a thinly veiled plan to create more native plant areas.

Now I know native plant areas are a pet project of GGNRA management. But I wish you would remember that Pacificans, as a whole, did not turn over these properties to the Golden Gate National Recreation Area -- and I emphasize the word

"recreation" -- to create habitats. Because those habitats eliminate people and their pets. And we like to recreate in the entire areas of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area. That's why we gave our properties to you.

So, that's what I have to say. Thanks.

[Applause.]

MS. STOTT: Thank you.

Our next speaker is Vi Gotelli, followed by Stephen Golub. Sorry if I messed up your name.

STATEMENT OF

VI GOTELLI

MS. GOTELLI: Vi Gotelli.

I'm concerned, too, about what they talk about when they call it "controlled burning." I've never seen any controlled burning that didn't create some kind of a problem.

In Oakland, they took down a bunch of the eucalyptus trees there; and, within two months, had one of the biggest landslides you ever saw. Because it takes time for rooting.

Our trees are beautiful. I've lived here 40 years and I've yet to see any of our trees burn. When a eucalyptus tree burns, it explodes; it doesn't burn. Because of the oil content, it explodes. So

you'd have to have a heck of a parameter around the land to protect all that is around it.

So I would hope, very deeply, as the last speaker said, that we go on using this as recreational land, enjoying those trees. Enjoying what we gave you, as a gift from this city, to take care of, not to create a problem with. We've never had a problem, and I'm hoping that you look at it very, very carefully before you think of burning down all those eucalyptus trees up there. Because this is our land and it's still in our city. It's a gift for you to take care of, not to destroy.

Thank you.

MS. STOTT: Thank you.

Stephen, followed by Carolyn Blair.

STATEMENT OF

STEPHEN GOLUB.

MR. GOLUB: Yes. I would like to echo the sentiments of some of the previous speakers. I think they were right on the money. I think what we have here, clearly, is another case of a solution looking for a problem.

Statistics provided by the Pacifica Fire Department really confirm that there really has been no past, present, or no future danger of wildfires in

Pacifica. So I think what we really have here is a case of GGNRA ignoring the historical usage of these areas with an agenda of creating natural areas, museums, where we used to formerly recreate. As examples, we saw that at Fort Funston, Crissy Field, and it goes on and on with GGNRA. And these areas become closed off to humans and humans' best friend. So I find that unacceptable.

I would like GGNRA to reconsider their position on this and the need for this particular venture.

Thank you.

MS. STOTT: Thank you.

Our last speaker is Carolyn Blair.

STATEMENT OF

CAROLYN BLAIR

SAN FRANCISCO TREE COUNCIL

MS. BLAIR: Carolyn Blair, San Francisco Tree Council.

It is our experience that the natural areas cause fire hazards, with the debris, with the unnatural barriers that they create for their plants. We had physical reality of that in McClaren Park, where the fire destroyed acres of trees. Also mentioned, just prior, at San Bruno, we lost 55 acres.

We really do question your using the word "controlled burn," when we find that the physical reality is that the fire experts, from the state, could not control this burn in San Bruno Mountain. And, like I said, we lost 55 acres of trees and put the threat of residents at risk.

I'd like to say to you that our trees are our No. 1 source of resource that is very valuable to us, regardless of whether they are native or non-native. And I noted in your list here, in this news article, that you list several -- looks like about 10 -- native trees that are prone to fire. We'd like to say, basically, almost all trees are prone to fire. What is really needed is better maintenance of the understory. If there was maintenance of the understory in the Oakland Hills -- which, by the way, without maintenance, took 100 years to catch fire, as well as the San Bruno Mountains, there was never a fire there for 135 years. All of this is due not to the eucalyptus, but due to the lack of money, a budget, for maintenance of the understory, for clearing, which should properly be done.

We'd ask you to carefully consider this: When you remove trees, you create other problems, such as winds; and, when you remove trees, that causes the

rest of the forest to be at risk due to exposure to winds, erosion, water runoff. I mean, there are so many valuable resources that trees bring in comparison to little native plants.

Thank you.

MS. STOTT: Thank you.

Does staff have any comments, or anything you want to say to wrap up?

MR. NAAR: One of the things we're certainly considering is exactly what the last speaker was referring to, which is maintenance. So not clearcutting areas of trees, whether they're native or non-native, or removing acres of shrubs or grasses whether they're, again, native or not native. But, indeed, creating what we call shaded fuel breaks, which might be removing some of the litter under trees, removing the limbs at Fort Funston that have fallen. That's exactly one of the things that we're looking at doing, and not putting -- it's just as much of an option, as a prescribed fire, or other treatments, which may be no treatment.

[Unrecorded voice.]

MR. NAAR: I think it's there, but we'll certainly -- your comments tonight will be posted on our web site, I believe. Is that correct? Yeah,

that's right.

Anything else? Wendy.

MS. POINSOT: I just wanted to thank you, for all your comments. As we explained before, we don't have a plan yet. So all the things that you brought up this evening will be considered as we're formulating the plan. And those are exactly the kind of comments that we would like to receive from the public.

So based on your familiarity with the land, not just in San Mateo County, but GGNRA lands in the City and in Marin County, please send us your comments on areas that you consider to be important, on ways that you think we should approach fire management, reduction of fire risks, and any environmental issues that you think should be covered in an Environmental Impact Statement.

So this is a good example of public input. We do want to hear what your concerns are. And those were definitely some very important concerns expressed tonight. Those will be considered as we put the plan together. So I want to thank you very much.

You have, listed on the flyer, the means to submit additional comments, and we hope to hear from you.



MS. STOTT: Thank you.

That does it for tonight. We'd like to thank you all for coming. Just a reminder that our next meeting will be Tuesday, November 18, at 7:00, at Fort Mason, Building 201. If you're on the mailing list, you will receive a notification of this meeting. You can also check the web site for meeting information, which [www.nps.gov/goga](http://www.nps.gov/goga). And, if you're not on the mailing list, you can sign up in the back.

So thanks again for coming.

[There were 60 members of the public in attendance at this meeting.]

(Whereupon, at 9:15 p.m., the public meeting was adjourned, to reconvene at 7:00 p.m., Tuesday, November 18, 2003, GGNRA Headquarters, Building 201, Fort Mason.)

## C E R T I F I C A T E

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the Department of Interior, National Park Service, of the meeting held as therein appears, and that this is the original transcript thereof for the files of the Golden Gate National Recreation Area .

James W. Higgins, CVR  
Official Reporter